arXiv:1202.2502v1 [math.PR] 12 Feb 2012

# Viscosity Solutions of Path-Dependent PDEs and Non-Markovian Forward-Backward Stochastic Systems

Andrea Cosso*

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32, 20133 Milano, Italy*

## Abstract

It is known that Markovian forward-backward systems are related to systems of semilinear parabolic PDEs. In this paper we extend this result to the non-Markovian case, proving that a non-Markovian forward-backward system is related to a certain path-dependent PDE (PPDE), a new kind of PDE recently introduced within the framework of functional Itô calculus. In particular, we give the definition of viscosity solution for the PPDE related to our specific case and we prove that, under quite general hypotheses, the forward-backward system provides the unique continuous viscosity solution to the path-dependent PDE.

*Keywords:* Non-Markovian BSDEs, Path-dependent PDEs, Functional Itô calculus, Viscosity solutions

## 1. Introduction

It became clear, after the publication of the papers by Peng [11] and by Pardoux and Peng [10], that Markovian backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs) were related to systems of semilinear parabolic partial differential equations, via the nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula. In the present paper we generalize this result to the non-Markovian case, proving that, under suitable hypotheses, the BSDE yields the unique viscosity solution to a so-called path-dependent PDE (PPDE), introduced recently by Dupire [6] within the framework of functional Itô calculus, further developed by Cont and Fournié [3, 4, 5]. We adopt the definition of viscosity solution for path-dependent PDEs presented in Peng [12].

We give an outline of the problem. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be the Wiener space on $[0,T]$ and $W = (W(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ be the canonical $d$-dimensional Wiener process. Then, for every $t \in [0,T]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, consider the following non-Markovian forward-backward system:

$$\begin{cases} X(s) = x + \int_t^s b(r, X(r))\mathrm{d}r + \int_t^s \sigma(r, X(r))\mathrm{d}W(r), \\ Y(s) = g(X(T)) + \int_s^T f(r, X(r), Y(r), Z(r))\mathrm{d}r - \int_s^T Z(r)\mathrm{d}W(r), \end{cases}$$

for every $s \in [t,T]$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., where $b$, $\sigma$, $f$ and $g$ are stochastic. Suppose that there exists a unique solution $(X^{t,x}, Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x}) = (X^{t,x}(s), Y^{t,x}(s), Z^{t,x}(s))_{s\in[t,T]}$ to the above system. We are interested in

---

*Tel.: +39-02-2399-4508; fax: +39-02-2399-4513.

*E-mail address:* andrea.cosso@mail.polimi.it

the following function:

$$u(t,x) := Y^{t,x}(t), \qquad \forall (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Observe that the function $u$ depends also on $\omega$, therefore it is more properly a random field. This random field was studied by Tang in [14], who proved that, under suitable assumptions, $u$ is a classical solution to the following non-Markovian backward stochastic partial differential equation (BSPDE):

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{d}u(t,x) = -\mathcal{L}u(t,x)\mathrm{d}t - f(t,x,u(t,x),v(t,x) + \nabla_x u(t,x)\sigma(t,x))\mathrm{d}t & \\ \qquad\qquad - \mathrm{tr}[\nabla_x v(t,x)\sigma(t,x)]\mathrm{d}t + v(t,x)\mathrm{d}W(t), & (t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(T,x) = g(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

where the operator $\mathcal{L}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}u = \langle \nabla_x u, b \rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[\sigma\sigma' \nabla_x^2 u]$$

and

$$v(t,x) := Z^{t,x}(t) - \nabla_x u(t,x)\sigma(t,x), \qquad \forall (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

The focus on classical solutions only has relevant implications on the assumptions. We note, in particular, that in [14] the author requires $f$ to be linear in $z$. To avoid these strong assumptions, it would be convenient to adopt a notion of viscosity solution for stochastic partial differential equations, as presented in the papers by Buckdahn and Ma [1, 2] and by Lions and Souganidis [8, 9]. However, in the present paper, we decided to proceed in another direction, applying the tools provided by the functional Itô calculus to prove that the random field $u$ is a viscosity solution of a path-dependent PDE.

We derive formally the correct expression of this path-dependent PDE. To this purpose, we apply the results presented in Peng and Wang [13], valid only for non-Markovian BSDEs, to our non-Markovian BSPDE. In particular, in [13] the authors relate non-Markovian backward stochastic differential equations to path-dependent PDEs. More precisely, they provide a nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula for classical solutions of path-dependent PDEs in terms of non-Markovian backward stochastic differential equations. We can exploit these results in our context, only formally, to associate a path-dependent PDE to our backward stochastic partial differential equation. Indeed, for every fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can think of our non-Markovian BSPDE as a non-Markovian BSDE, then, following [13], we deduce the PPDE for $u$:

$$\begin{cases} D_t u(t,x) + \mathcal{L}u(t,x) + f(t,x,u(t,x), D_z u(t,x) + \nabla_x u(t,x)\sigma(t,x)) + & \\ \qquad\qquad + \mathrm{tr}[\nabla_x D_z u(t,x)\sigma(t,x)] + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[D_{zz} u(t,x)] = 0, & (t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(T,x) = g(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

where $D_t$, $D_z$ and $D_{zz}$ are the so-called pathwise or functional derivatives, which act along the path $\omega \in \Omega$. We note that the above equation is not precisely a path-dependent PDE, due to the presence of the classical derivatives $\nabla_x u$ and $\nabla_x^2 u$. For this reason, in the paper, we refer to it as mixed-path-dependent PDE (MPPDE).

To prove rigorously that there is a relation between the above mixed-path-dependent PDE and the non-Markovian forward-backward stochastic system, we have to fit the latter into the framework of functional Itô calculus (this task is carried out in Section 3). Then we have to provide the definition of viscosity solution for the mixed-path-dependent PDE. Our definition combines the definition of viscosity solution for PDEs with the new definition for path-dependent PDEs, recently given by Peng [12]. We observe that there exists another definition of viscosity solution for path-dependent PDEs, given by Ekren at al. [7], that applies when $u$ is defined on the space of continuous (not càdlàg) paths, which it is slightly more subtle. The path space on which $u$ is defined depends on the definition of the non-Markovian forward-backward system, which in our case we chose to be the space of càdlàg paths, inspired by [13].

Finally, we prove that there exists a unique viscosity solution to the mixed-path-dependent PDE. In particular, we show that the uniqueness for the mixed-path-dependent PDE is a consequence of the uniqueness, in the viscosity sense, for a certain path-dependent PDE. Therefore, we can exploit the comparison theorem for path-dependent PDEs, proved in [12], to derive a comparison theorem in our context.

The plan of the paper is as follows: Section 2 is devoted to fix the notations and to present some fundamental results regarding functional Itô calculus. In Section 3 we study the non-Markovian forward-backward system within the framework of functional Itô calculus; in particular, the existence and uniqueness theorem and the comparison principle are given. In Section 4 the continuous dependence of the solution of the BSDE with respect to the initial state is proved. In Section 5 the mixed-path-dependent PDE is studied; we give the definition of viscosity solution for the MPPDE via test functions and by means of jets, proving that the two definitions coincide; we prove that the non-Markovian forward-backward system provides a viscosity solution to the MPPDE. Finally, Section 6 is devoted to the proof of the comparison theorem.

## 2. Notations

We introduce the main tools of functional Itô calculus needed later, following closely [6]. Let $T > 0$ be fixed. For each $t \in [0, T]$ we denote by $\Lambda_t^k$ the set of càdlàg $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued functions on $[0, t]$. A generic element of $\Lambda_t^k$ is denoted by $\gamma_t$. Its value at time $s \in [0, t]$ is indicated by $\gamma_t(s)$, therefore $\gamma_t = \gamma_t(s)_{0 \leqslant s \leqslant t}$. We also use this notation:

$$\gamma_t = \gamma_t(s)_{0 \leqslant s \leqslant t} = (\gamma_t(s)_{0 \leqslant s < t}, \gamma_t(t)),$$

to emphasize the terminal position $\gamma_t(t)$ of the path $\gamma_t$. For each $\gamma_t \in \Lambda_t^k$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^k$ we denote by $\gamma_t^\xi = (\gamma_t(s)_{0 \leqslant s < t}, \gamma_t(t) + \xi)$, therefore $\gamma_t^\xi \in \Lambda_t^k$. For every $t \in [0, T]$, $\Lambda_t^k$ is a Banach space with respect to the following norm:

$$\|\gamma_t\| := \sup_{s \in [0,t]} |\gamma_t(s)|, \qquad \gamma_t \in \Lambda_t^k.$$

We observe that the norm should depend on $t$, however to simplify the notation we dropped this dependence.

We introduce the space $\Lambda^k = \bigcup_{t \in [0,T]} \Lambda_t^k$. A generic element of $\Lambda^k$ is therefore given by $\gamma_t \in \Lambda_t^k$, for some $t \in [0, T]$. We now define a distance on $\Lambda^k$. For each $0 \leqslant t \leqslant \bar{t} \leqslant T$, $\gamma_t \in \Lambda_t^k$ and $\overline{\gamma}_{\bar{t}} \in \Lambda_{\bar{t}}^k$, we denote

$$\mathrm{d}_\infty(\gamma_t, \overline{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) := \max\Big( \sup_{s \in [0,t]} \{|\gamma_t(s) - \overline{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}(s)|\}, \sup_{s \in (t, \bar{t}]} \{|\gamma_t(t) - \overline{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}(s)|\}\Big) + |t - \bar{t}|.$$

**Definition 2.1.** *A functional* $u\colon \Lambda^k \to \mathbb{R}$ *is said to be* $\Lambda^k$*-continuous at* $\gamma_t \in \Lambda^k$ *if whenever* $\gamma^n_{t_n} \in \Lambda^k$*, with* $\mathrm{d}_\infty(\gamma^n_{t_n}, \gamma_t) \to 0$*, we have* $u(\gamma^n_{t_n}) \to u(\gamma_t)$*. The functional* $u$ *is said to be* $\Lambda^k$*-continuous if it is* $\Lambda^k$*-continuous at each* $\gamma_t \in \Lambda^k$*.*

Now we introduce the main tools of functional Itô calculus, i.e., the so-called pathwise or functional derivatives.

**Definition 2.2.** *Let* $u\colon \Lambda^k \to \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\gamma_t \in \Lambda^k$ *be given. If there exists* $p \in \mathbb{R}^k$ *such that*

$$u(\gamma^\xi_t) = u(\gamma_t) + \langle p, \xi\rangle + o(|\xi|),$$

*then we say that* $u$ *is (vertically) differentiable at* $\gamma_t$ *and we define* $D_\xi u(\gamma_t) := p$*. The functional* $u$ *is said to be vertically differentiable in* $\Lambda^k$ *if* $D_\xi u(\gamma_t)$ *exists at every* $\gamma_t \in \Lambda^k$*. Analogously, we can define the Hessian matrix* $D_{\xi\xi}u(\gamma_t)$*, which is an* $\mathbb{S}(k)$*-valued functional, where* $\mathbb{S}(k)$ *is the set of all* $k \times k$ *symmetric matrices.*

We adopt the following notation for every $\gamma_t \in \Lambda^k$ and $s \in [0, T]$:

$$\gamma_{t,s}(r) = \gamma_t(r \wedge t), \qquad r \in [0, s],$$

then $\gamma_{t,s} \in \Lambda^k_s$.

**Definition 2.3.** *Let* $u\colon \Lambda^k \to \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\gamma_t \in \Lambda^k$*. If we have*

$$u(\gamma_{t,s}) = u(\gamma_t) + a(s - t) + o(|s - t|), \qquad s \geqslant t,$$

*then we say that* $u$ *is (horizontally) differentiable at* $\gamma_t$ *and we define* $D_t u(\gamma_t) := a$*. The functional* $u$ *is said to be horizontally differentiable in* $\Lambda^k$ *if* $D_t u(\gamma_t)$ *exists at every* $\gamma_t \in \Lambda^k$*.*

**Definition 2.4.** *We denote by* $\mathbb{C}^{j,\ell}(\Lambda^k)$ *the set of functionals* $u\colon \Lambda^k \to \mathbb{R}$*, which are* $j$ *times horizontally differentiable and* $\ell$ *times vertically differentiable in* $\Lambda^k$*, such that all these derivatives are* $\Lambda^k$*-continuous.*

As shown in the following remark, when the functional $u$ depends only on the terminal position of the path, i.e., $u$ is a function defined on an Euclidean space, functional derivatives turn into classical derivatives.

**Remark 2.5.** *If* $u(\gamma_t) = f(t, \gamma_t(t))$*, for all* $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^k$*, with* $f \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^k)$*, then*

$$D_t u(\gamma_t) = \partial_t f(t, \gamma_t(t))$$

*and*

$$D_\xi u(\gamma_t) = \nabla_\xi f(t, \gamma_t(t)), \qquad D_{\xi\xi} u(\gamma_t) = \nabla_{\xi\xi} f(t, \gamma_t(t)),$$

*with* $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T) \times \Lambda^k$*.*

We are now in the position to state the main result of functional Itô calculus, namely the functional Itô's formula, firstly proved in [6] and then generalized in [3, 4, 5]. Before we need the following remark.

**Remark 2.6.** *Consider a stochastic process* $X = (X(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ *on a probability space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$*. Let* $t \in [0, T]$*, then we denote by* $X(t)$ *the value of* $X$ *at time* $t$ *and by* $X_t$ *the path of* $X$ *up to time* $t$*, i.e.,* $X_t = X(s)_{0\leqslant s\leqslant t}$*.*

**Theorem 2.7** (Functional Itô's formula)**.** *Let* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}, \mathbb{P})$ *be a filtered probability space. If* $X = (X(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ *is a continuous k-dimensional semi-martingale and* $u \in \mathbb{C}^{1,2}(\Lambda^k)$*, then for any* $t \in [0, T)$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

$$u(X_t) = u(X_0) + \int_0^t D_s u(X_s)\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t D_\xi u(X_s)\mathrm{d}X(s) + \\ + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t D_{\xi\xi} u(X_s)\mathrm{d}\langle X\rangle(s). \tag{1}$$

## 3. Non-Markovian Forward-Backward System

In the present section we fit the non-Markovian forward-backward system into the framework of functional Itô calculus, following [13].

Let $\Omega = C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathbb{P}$ the Wiener measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$. We denote by $W = (W(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ the canonical Wiener process, with $W(t, \omega) = \omega(t)$, $t \in [0, T]$, $\omega \in \Omega$. For any $t \in [0, T]$, we denote by $\mathcal{F}_t$ the $\mathbb{P}$-completion of $\sigma(W(s), s \in [0, t])$.

Let $t \in [0, T]$, $\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We consider the following non-Markovian forward-backward system:

$$\begin{cases} X_{\zeta_t,x}(s) = x + \int_t^s b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))\mathrm{d}r + \int_t^s \sigma(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))\mathrm{d}W(r), \\ Y_{\zeta_t,x}(s) = g(W_T^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(T)) + \int_s^T f(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Y_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r))\mathrm{d}r \\ \qquad\qquad - \int_s^T Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r)\mathrm{d}W(r), \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

for every $s \in [t, T]$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., where

$$W^{\zeta_t}(r) := \zeta_t(r)\mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}(r) + (\zeta_t(t) + W(r) - W(t))\mathbb{1}_{(t,T]}(r), \qquad \forall r \in [0, T].$$

We assume that $X_{\zeta_t,x}(s) = x$ for $s \in [0, t)$, so that the BSDE can be solved on the interval $[0, T]$.

We impose the following conditions on the drift $b\colon \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and on the diffusion part $\sigma\colon \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$ of our forward SDE:

**$(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$** $b$ and $\sigma$ are continuous functions on $\Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d$ and $x, \overline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$|b(\zeta_t, x) - b(\zeta_t, \overline{x})| + |\sigma(\zeta_t, x) - \sigma(\zeta_t, \overline{x})| \leqslant C|x - \overline{x}|$$

and

$$|b(\zeta_t, 0)| + |\sigma(\zeta_t, 0)| \leqslant C.$$

On the generator $f\colon \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and on the terminal condition $g\colon \Lambda_T^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ of our backward SDE, we make the following assumptions:

**$(\mathbf{H}_g)$** $g$ is a continuous function on $\Lambda_T^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover there exist two constants $C > 0$ and $q \geqslant 1$ such that for any $\zeta_T \in \Lambda_T^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$|g(\zeta_T, x)| \leqslant C(1 + ||\zeta_T||^q + |x|^q).$$

**($\mathbf{H}_f$)** $f$ is a continuous function on $\Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover there exist two constants $C > 0$ and $q \geqslant 1$ such that for any $\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y, \overline{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z, \overline{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$|f(\zeta_t, x, y, z) - f(\zeta_t, x, \overline{y}, \overline{z})| \leqslant C(|y - \overline{y}| + |z - \overline{z}|)$$

and

$$|f(\zeta_t, x, 0, 0)| \leqslant C(1 + \|\zeta_t\|^q + |x|^q).$$

Furthermore, we assume that for every $(t, \zeta_t, x, z) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the function

$$y \mapsto f(\zeta_t, x, y, z),$$

is nonincreasing on $\mathbb{R}$.

**Remark 3.1.** *In assumption* **($\mathbf{H}_f$)**, *the last requirement about the monotonicity of $f$ with respect to $y$ is used only to simplify the proof of the Comparison Theorem, Theorem 6.6, and it is not a loss of generality. Indeed, if we do not assume this hypothesis, thanks to the Lipschitzianity of $f$ with respect to $y$, we can always return to the case in which $f$ is nonincreasing with respect to $y$.*

**Definition 3.2.** *We introduce the following spaces of stochastic processes:*

(i) $\mathbb{S}^p(0, T)$, *with* $p \geqslant 1$, *the space of all* $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$*-adapted,* $\mathbb{R}$*-valued continuous processes* $Y = (Y(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T} |Y(t)|^p\Big] < \infty.$$

(ii) $\mathbb{M}^p(0, T)^d$, *with* $p \geqslant 1$, *the space of all* $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$*-adapted,* $\mathbb{R}^d$*-valued processes* $Z = (Z(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\int_0^T |Z(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\Big] < \infty.$$

We recall the following standard results.

**Lemma 3.3** (Existence and Uniqueness)**.** *Under assumptions* **($\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma}$)**, **($\mathbf{H}_f$)** *and* **($\mathbf{H}_g$)**, *for every* $t \in [0, T]$, $\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d$ *and* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$*:*

(i) *There exists a unique strong solution* $X_{\zeta_t,x}$ *to the forward SDE in (2), which belongs to* $\mathbb{S}^p(0, T)^n$ *(the cartesian product of* $\mathbb{S}^p(0, T)$ *by itself $n$ times), for all* $p \geqslant 1$. *Moreover there exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{t\leqslant s\leqslant T} |X_{\zeta_t,x}(s)|^p\Big] \leqslant C(1 + |x|^p), \tag{3}$$

*for all* $p \geqslant 1$.

(ii) *The BSDE in (2) admits a unique solution* $(Y_{\zeta_t,x}, Z_{\zeta_t,x}) \in \mathbb{S}^2(0, T) \times \mathbb{M}^2(0, T)^d$, *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{t\leqslant s\leqslant T} |Y_{\zeta_t,x}(s)|^2\Big] + \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^T |Z_{\zeta_t,x}(s)|^2 \mathrm{d}s\Big] \leqslant C\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|g(W_T^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(T))\Big|^2\Big] + \tag{4}$$
$$+ C\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^T \Big|f(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r), 0, 0)\Big|^2 dr\Big],$$

*for some constant* $C > 0$.

*Finally*

$$u(\zeta_t, x) := Y_{\zeta_t,x}(t), \qquad \forall t \in [0,T], \zeta_t \in \Lambda^d, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{5}$$

*defines a deterministic function* $u\colon \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$.

**Lemma 3.4** (Comparison Principle)**.** *Suppose that assumption* $(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$ *holds true and let* $t \in [0,T]$, $\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d$ *and* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. *Consider two pairs of generator and terminal condition* $(f_1, g_1)$ *and* $(f_2, g_2)$ *satisfying assumptions* $(\mathbf{H}_f)$ *and* $(\mathbf{H}_g)$. *Denote by* $(Y^1_{\zeta_t,x}, Z^1_{\zeta_t,x})$ *and* $(Y^2_{\zeta_t,x}, Z^2_{\zeta_t,x})$ *the solutions to their corresponding BSDEs. If:*

(i) $g_1(W^{\zeta_t}_T, X_{\zeta_t,x}(T)) \leqslant g_2(W^{\zeta_t}_T, X_{\zeta_t,x}(T))$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

(ii) $f_1(W^{\zeta_t}_s, X_{\zeta_t,x}(s), Y^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s), Z^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s)) \leqslant f_2(W^{\zeta_t}_s, X_{\zeta_t,x}(s), Y^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s), Z^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s))$, $\mathrm{d}s \otimes \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}$-a.e.,

*then* $Y^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s) \leqslant Y^2_{\zeta_t,x}(s)$, *for all* $s \in [0,T]$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s..

*Furthermore, if* $Y^2_{\zeta_t,x}(t) \leqslant Y^1_{\zeta_t,x}(t)$, *then* $Y^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s) = Y^2_{\zeta_t,x}(s)$, *for all* $s \in [0,T]$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.. *In particular, if* $\mathbb{P}(g_1(W^{\zeta_t}_T, X_{\zeta_t,x}(T)) < g_2(W^{\zeta_t}_T, X_{\zeta_t,x}(T))) > 0$ *or* $f_1(W^{\zeta_t}_s, X_{\zeta_t,x}(s), Y^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s), Z^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s)) < f_2(W^{\zeta_t}_s, X_{\zeta_t,x}(s), Y^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s), Z^1_{\zeta_t,x}(s))$ *on a set of strictly positive measure* $\mathrm{d}s \otimes \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}$, *then* $Y^1_{\zeta_t,x}(t) < Y^2_{\zeta_t,x}(t)$.

## 4. Regularity

Our purpose is to prove that the non-Markovian forward-backward system provides the unique continuous viscosity solution of a certain path-dependent PDE. To prove the continuity part we study the dependence of $Y_{\zeta_t,x}$ with respect to the pair $(\zeta_t, x)$. We first need to consider the forward process $X_{\zeta_t,x}$ as a function of $(\zeta_t, x)$.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Under assumption* $(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$, *for every* $t, \bar{t} \in [0,T]$, $\zeta_t, \bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}} \in \Lambda^d$ *and* $x, \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, *we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_{\zeta_t,x}(s) - X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}},\bar{x}}(s)|^2] \to 0, \qquad \text{as } \mathrm{d}_\infty(\bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}, \zeta_t) \to 0 \text{ and } \bar{x} \to x,$$

*for all* $s \in [0,T]$.

*Proof.* The process $\bar{X}(s) := X_{\zeta_t,x}(s) - X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}},\bar{x}}(s)$, with $s \in [t \vee \bar{t}, T]$, solves the following stochastic equation

$$\bar{X}(s) = \bar{X}(t \vee \bar{t}) + \int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^s \bar{b}(r)\mathrm{d}r + \int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^s \bar{\sigma}(r)\mathrm{d}W(r),$$

where

$$\bar{b}(r) := b(W^{\zeta_t}_r, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - b(W^{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}}_r, X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}},\bar{x}}(r))$$

and

$$\bar{\sigma}(r) := \sigma(W^{\zeta_t}_r, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - \sigma(W^{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}}_r, X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}},\bar{x}}(r)),$$

for $r \in [t \vee \bar{t}, T]$. Applying Itô's formula to $\varphi(x) = |x|^2$ gives

$$|\bar{X}(s)|^2 = |\bar{X}(t \vee \bar{t})|^2 + 2\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^s \langle \bar{X}(r), \bar{b}(r)\rangle\mathrm{d}r + 2\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^s \langle \bar{X}(r), \bar{\sigma}(r)\mathrm{d}W(r)\rangle + \\ + \int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^s |\bar{\sigma}(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r.$$

Therefore we find

$$\mathbb{E}[|\overline{X}(s)|^2] = \mathbb{E}\Big[|\overline{X}(t \vee \bar{t})|^2 + 2\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} \langle \overline{X}(r), \bar{b}(r)\rangle \mathrm{d}r + \int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\bar{\sigma}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big]. \tag{6}$$

We can write $\bar{b}(r)$ and $\bar{\sigma}(r)$ in the following way:

$$\bar{b}(r) = b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - b(W_r^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) + b(W_r^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - b(W_r^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\zeta_{\bar t},\bar{x}}(r))$$

and

$$\bar{\sigma}(r) = \sigma(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - \sigma(W_r^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) + \sigma(W_r^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - \sigma(W_r^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\zeta_{\bar t},\bar{x}}(r)).$$

We define

$$\tilde{b}(r) := b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - b(W_r^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))$$

and

$$\tilde{\sigma}(r) := \sigma(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - \sigma(W_r^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)),$$

for $r \in [t \vee \bar{t}, T]$. As a consequence equation (6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|\overline{X}(s)|^2] \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[&|\overline{X}(t \vee \bar{t})|^2 + 2\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\overline{X}(r)||\tilde{b}(r)| \mathrm{d}r + 2C\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\overline{X}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r + \\ &+ 2\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\tilde{\sigma}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r + 2C^2\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\overline{X}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Young's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|\overline{X}(s)|^2] \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[&|\overline{X}(t \vee \bar{t})|^2 + \int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\overline{X}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r + \int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\tilde{b}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r + \\ &+ 2C\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\overline{X}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r + 2\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\tilde{\sigma}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r + 2C^2\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\overline{X}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big].\end{aligned}$$

From Gronwall's inequality we get

$$\mathbb{E}[|\overline{X}(s)|^2] \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[|\overline{X}(t \vee \bar{t})|^2 + \int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\tilde{b}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r + 2\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\tilde{\sigma}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big] \exp\left((1 + 2C + 2C^2)(s - t \vee \bar{t})\right).$$

Thanks to assumption $(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$, from the dominated convergence theorem we deduce that the terms $\mathbb{E}[\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\tilde{b}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\int_{t\vee\bar{t}}^{s} |\tilde{\sigma}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r]$ tend to zero when $\mathrm{d}_\infty(\zeta_{\bar t}, \zeta_t) \to 0$ and $\bar{x} \to x$.

To conclude, we analyze the term $|\overline{X}(t \vee \bar{t})|^2$. We consider only the case $t \leqslant \bar{t}$, since the other one is analogous. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{X}(t \vee \bar{t}) = \overline{X}(\bar{t}) = X_{\zeta_t,x}(\bar{t}) - \bar{x} = x - \bar{x} + &\int_t^{\bar{t}} b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) \mathrm{d}r + \\ &+ \int_t^{\bar{t}} \sigma(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) \mathrm{d}W(r).\end{aligned}$$

Applying Itô's formula to $\varphi(x) = |x-\bar{x}|^2$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\bar{X}(\bar{t})|^2 = {}& |x-\bar{x}|^2 + 2\int_t^{\bar{t}} \langle X_{\zeta_t,x}(r), b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))\rangle \mathrm{d}r + \\
&+ 2\int_t^{\bar{t}} \langle X_{\zeta_t,x}(r), \sigma(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))\mathrm{d}W(r)\rangle + \int_t^{\bar{t}} |\sigma(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))|^2 \mathrm{d}r.
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the expectation and using Young's inequality we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|\bar{X}(\bar{t})|^2] \leqslant {}& \mathbb{E}\Big[|x-\bar{x}|^2 + \int_t^{\bar{t}} |X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r + \int_t^{\bar{t}} |b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big] + \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^{\bar{t}} |\sigma(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big].
\end{aligned}
$$

Gronwall's inequality implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|\bar{X}(\bar{t})|^2] \leqslant {}& \mathbb{E}\Big[|x-\bar{x}|^2 + \int_t^{\bar{t}} |b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))|^2 \mathrm{d}r + \\
&+ \int_t^{\bar{t}} |\sigma(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big] \exp(t-\bar{t}).
\end{aligned}
$$

From assumption $(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$ we see that the term $\int_t^{\bar{t}} |b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))|^2 \mathrm{d}r$ satisfies the following inequality:

$$
\int_t^{\bar{t}} |b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))|^2 \mathrm{d}r \leqslant 2\int_t^{\bar{t}} |b(W_r^{\zeta_t}, 0)|^2 \mathrm{d}r + 2C^2 \int_t^{\bar{t}} |X_{\zeta_t,x}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r
$$

and an analogous inequality holds true for the term $\int_t^{\bar{t}} |\sigma(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r))|^2 \mathrm{d}r$. Therefore, from the dominated convergence theorem, we deduce that the quantity $\mathbb{E}[|\bar{X}(\bar{t})|^2]$ tends to zero, as $(\bar{t},\bar{x}) \to (t,x)$.

The proof that $\mathbb{E}[|\bar{X}(s)|^2]$ converges to zero, for $s \in [t,\bar{t})$, is similar to the proof with $s = \bar{t}$, since $X_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}},\bar{x}}(s) = \bar{x}$, for every $s \in [t,\bar{t})$. Finally, because of $\bar{X}(s) = x - \bar{x}$, for $s \in [0,t)$, we get the thesis. $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Under assumptions* $(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$, $(\mathbf{H}_f)$ *and* $(\mathbf{H}_g)$, *for every* $t,\bar{t} \in [0,T]$, $\zeta_t, \overline{\zeta_{\bar t}} \in \Lambda^d$ *and* $x,\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, *we have:*

$$
\mathbb{E}[|Y_{\zeta_t,x}(s) - Y_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}},\bar{x}}(s)|^2] \to 0, \qquad \textit{as } \mathrm{d}_\infty(\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}, \zeta_t) \to 0 \textit{ and } \bar{x} \to x,
$$

*for all* $s \in [0,T]$.

*Proof.* The pair $(Y_{\zeta_t,x} - Y_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}},\bar{x}}, Z_{\zeta_t,x} - Z_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}},\bar{x}})$ is the unique solution in $\mathbb{S}^2(0,T) \times \mathbb{M}^2(0,T)^d$ to the following BSDE:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y_{\zeta_t,x}(s) - Y_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}},\bar{x}}(s) = {}& g(W_T^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(T)) - g(W_T^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}},\bar{x}}(T)) + \\
&+ \int_s^T [\, f(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Y_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) \\
&- f(W_r^{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}}}, X_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}},\bar{x}}(r), Y_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}},\bar{x}}(r), Z_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar t}},\bar{x}}(r))]\mathrm{d}r
\end{aligned}
$$

$$-\int_s^T (Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r) - Z_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r))\mathrm{d}W(r).$$

We adopt the following notations:

$$\bar Y := Y_{\zeta_t,x} - Y_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}, \qquad \bar Z := Z_{\zeta_t,x} - Z_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x},$$

$$\bar g := g(W_T^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(T)) - g(W_T^{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t}}, X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(T))$$

and

$$\bar f(r) := f(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Y_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - f(W_r^{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t}}, X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r), Y_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r), Z_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r)),$$

for all $r \in [0,T]$. Applying Itô's formula to $\varphi(y) = |y|^2$ yields

$$|\bar Y(s)|^2 + \int_s^T |\bar Z(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r = |\bar g|^2 + 2\int_s^T \langle \bar Y(r), \bar f(r)\rangle\mathrm{d}r - 2\int_s^T \langle \bar Y(r), \bar Z(r)\mathrm{d}W(r)\rangle.$$

Taking the expectation we get

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar Y(s)|^2 + \int_s^T |\bar Z(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar g|^2 + 2\int_s^T \langle \bar Y(r), \bar f(r)\rangle\mathrm{d}r\Big]. \tag{7}$$

We can write $\bar f(r)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar f(r) = {} & f(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Y_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - f(W_r^{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t}}, X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r), Y_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) + \\ & + f(W_r^{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t}}, X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r), Y_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - f(W_r^{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t}}, X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r), Y_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r), Z_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r))\end{aligned}$$

and we define

$$\tilde f(r) := f(W_r^{\zeta_t}, X_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Y_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r)) - f(W_r^{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t}}, X_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar t},\bar x}(r), Y_{\zeta_t,x}(r), Z_{\zeta_t,x}(r)),$$

for $r \in [0,T]$. Therefore, from equation (7) and assumption $(\mathbf{H}_f)$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar Y(s)|^2 + \int_s^T |\bar Z(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r\Big] \leqslant {} & \mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar g|^2 + 2\int_s^T |\bar Y(r)||\tilde f(r)|\mathrm{d}r\Big] + \\ & + 2C\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_s^T |\bar Y(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r + \int_s^T |\bar Y(r)||\bar Z(r)|\mathrm{d}r\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/(2C))$, then Young's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar Y(s)|^2 + \int_s^T |\bar Z(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r\Big] \leqslant {} & \mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar g|^2 + \int_s^T |\bar Y(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r + \int_s^T |\tilde f(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r\Big] + \\ & + 2C\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_s^T |\bar Y(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_s^T |\bar Y(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r + \varepsilon\int_s^T |\bar Z(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r\Big].\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence we find

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar Y(s)|^2\Big] \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar g|^2 + \int_s^T |\tilde f(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r\Big] + \Big(1 + 2C + \frac{2C}{\varepsilon}\Big)\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_s^T |\bar Y(r)|^2\mathrm{d}r\Big].$$

An application of Gronwall's inequality gives

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar{Y}(s)|^2\Big] \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[|\bar{g}|^2 + \int_s^T |\tilde{f}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big] \exp\left((1 + 2C + 2C/\varepsilon)(T - s)\right).$$

Thanks to assumptions $(\mathbf{H}_f)$ and $(\mathbf{H}_g)$, using Lemma 4.1 and the dominated convergence theorem, we deduce that the two terms $\mathbb{E}[|\bar{g}|^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\int_s^T |\tilde{f}(r)|^2 \mathrm{d}r]$ go to zero as $\mathrm{d}_\infty(\overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}}, \zeta_t) \to 0$ and $\bar{x} \to x$, hence we get the thesis. ☐

**Theorem 4.3.** *Under assumptions* $(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$, $(\mathbf{H}_f)$ *and* $(\mathbf{H}_g)$, *the function $u$ defined in (5) is continuous on* $\Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

*Proof.* Let $t, \bar{t} \in [0, T]$, $\zeta_t, \overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}} \in \Lambda^d$ and $x, \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then we have

$$u(\zeta_t, x) - u(\overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}}, \bar{x}) = Y_{\zeta_t,x}(t) - Y_{\zeta_t,x}(\bar{t}) + Y_{\zeta_t,x}(\bar{t}) - Y_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}},\bar{x}}(\bar{t}).$$

In particular

$$\mathbb{E}[|u(\zeta_t, x) - u(\overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}}, \bar{x})|^2] \leqslant 2\mathbb{E}[|Y_{\zeta_t,x}(t) - Y_{\zeta_t,x}(\bar{t})|^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[|Y_{\zeta_t,x}(\bar{t}) - Y_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}},\bar{x}}(\bar{t})|^2].$$

From Lemma 4.2 we know that the last term goes to zero as $\mathrm{d}_\infty(\overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}}, \zeta_t) \to 0$ and $\bar{x} \to x$. Therefore it is enough to prove that the term $\mathbb{E}[|Y_{\zeta_t,x}(t) - Y_{\zeta_t,x}(\bar{t})|^2]$ goes to zero as well. This follows from the fact that $Y_{\zeta_t,x} \in \mathbb{S}^2(0, T)$ and from the dominated convergence theorem. ☐

We end this section proving that the function $u$ satisfies a polynomial growth condition, the same required to apply the Comparison Theorem, Theorem 6.6.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Under assumptions* $(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$, $(\mathbf{H}_f)$ *and* $(\mathbf{H}_g)$, *the function $u$ defined in (5) satisfies the following polynomial growth condition: There exists an integer $m > 0$ such that for every* $(\bar{t}, \overline{\zeta_T}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^d_T$ *we have*

$$\frac{|u(\zeta_t^z, x)|}{1 + |(z, x)|^m} \to 0, \qquad \textit{as} \quad |(z, x)| \to \infty, \tag{8}$$

*uniformly in* $t \in [0, T]$ *and* $\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}}}$, *where*

$$\Lambda^d_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}}} := \bigcup_{r \in [0,\bar{t}]} \Big\{\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d \colon \zeta_t(s) = \overline{\zeta_T}(s \wedge r),\ s \in [0, t]\Big\}.$$

*Proof.* Let $(\bar{t}, \overline{\zeta_T}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^d_T$, $(t, \zeta_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^d_{\overline{\zeta_{\bar{t}}}}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. From the definition (5) of $u$ and the estimate (4) we have (in the sequel the letter $C$ stands for a positive constant, whose value may change from line to line):

$$|u(\zeta_t^z, x)|^2 = |Y_{\zeta_t^z,x}(t)|^2 \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{s \in [t,T]} |Y_{\zeta_t^z,x}(s)|^2\Big] \leqslant C\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|g(W_T^{\zeta_t^z}, X_{\zeta_t^z,x}(T))\Big|^2\Big] +$$
$$+ C\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^T \Big|f(W_r^{\zeta_t^z}, X_{\zeta_t^z,x}(r), 0, 0)\Big|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big].$$

Assumptions **($\mathbf{H}_f$)** and **($\mathbf{H}_g$)** yield

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\big|g(W_T^{\zeta_t^z}, X_{\zeta_t^z,x}(T))\big|^2\Big] + \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^T \big|f(W_r^{\zeta_t^z}, X_{\zeta_t^z,x}(r), 0, 0)\big|^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big] \leqslant C\mathbb{E}\Big[(1 + \|W_T^{\zeta_t^z}\|^q + |X_{\zeta_t^z,x}(T)|^q)^2\Big] + \\ + C\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^T (1 + \|W_r^{\zeta_t^z}\|^q + |X_{\zeta_t^z,x}(r)|^q)^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big].$$

From estimate (3) we find:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[(1 + \|W_T^{\zeta_t^z}\|^q + |X_{\zeta_t^z,x}(T)|^q)^2\Big] + \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^T (1 + \|W_r^{\zeta_t^z}\|^q + |X_{\zeta_t^z,x}(r)|^q)^2 \mathrm{d}r\Big] \leqslant C\Big(1 + |x|^{2q} + \\ + \mathbb{E}\Big[\|W_T^{\zeta_t^z}\|^{2q}\Big] + \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_t^T \|W_r^{\zeta_t^z}\|^{2q} \mathrm{d}r\Big]\Big).$$

Note that, for $r \in [t, T]$,

$$\|W_r^{\zeta_t^z}\|^{2q} = \sup_{s\in[0,r]} |W_r^{\zeta_t^z}(s)|^{2q} = \sup_{s\in[0,r]} |W_r^{\zeta_t}(s) + z\mathbb{1}_{[t,r]}(s)|^{2q} \leqslant 2^{2q-1}(\|W_r^{\zeta_t}\|^{2q} + |z|^{2q}).$$

Furthermore, since $\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d_{\overline{\zeta}_t}$, there exists $w \in [0, \overline{t}]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_r^{\zeta_t}\|^{2q} = \sup_{s\in[0,r]} |W_r^{\zeta_t}(s)|^{2q} &= \sup_{s\in[0,r]} |\zeta_t(s)\mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}(s) + (\zeta_t(t) + W(s) - W(t))\mathbb{1}_{(t,r]}(s)|^{2q} = \\ &= \sup_{s\in[0,r]} |\overline{\zeta}_T(s \wedge w)\mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}(s) + (\overline{\zeta}_T(t \wedge w) + W(s) - W(t))\mathbb{1}_{(t,r]}(s)|^{2q} \leqslant \\ &\leqslant 2^{2q-1}\Big(\|\overline{\zeta}_T\|^{2q} + \sup_{s\in(t,r]} |W(s) - W(t)|^{2q}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$|u(\zeta_t^z, x)|^2 \leqslant C(1 + |z|^{2q} + |x|^{2q}),$$

from which we deduce the thesis. □

## 5. Mixed-path-dependent PDE

We now present the path-dependent PDE related to the non-Markovian forward-backward system. This PDE was derived in the introduction, where we noticed the occurrence of classical derivatives. For this reason we called it a mixed-path-dependent PDE (MPPDE). In the present section we study it rigorously, giving the notion of viscosity solution and proving that the non-Markovian forward-backward system provides a viscosity solution to the MPPDE.

Consider the following mixed-path-dependent PDE:

$$\begin{cases} D_t u(\zeta_t, x) + \mathcal{L}u(\zeta_t, x) + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[D_{zz}u(\zeta_t, x)] + \mathrm{tr}[\nabla_x D_z u(\zeta_t, x)\sigma(\zeta_t, x)] + \\ \qquad + f(\zeta_t, x, u(\zeta_t, x), D_z u(\zeta_t, x) + \nabla_x u(\zeta_t, x)\sigma(\zeta_t, x)) = 0, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{on } [0, T) \times \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(\zeta_T, x) = g(\zeta_T, x), \qquad\qquad\qquad \text{on } \Lambda_T^d \times \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where the operator $\mathcal{L}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}u(\zeta_t,x)=\langle\nabla_x u(\zeta_t,x),b(\zeta_t,x)\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[\sigma(\zeta_t,x)\sigma'(\zeta_t,x)\nabla_x^2 u(\zeta_t,x)],$$

for every $(t,\zeta_t,x)\in[0,T]\times\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$.

We introduce the notion of test function, since we need it in the definition of viscosity solution.

**Definition 5.1.** *A function $\varphi\colon\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ is said to be of class $\mathbb{C}^{1,2,2}(\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ if $\varphi$ is continuous on $\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$ together with its derivatives $D_t\varphi$, $D_z\varphi$, $\nabla_x\varphi$, $D_{zz}\varphi$, $\nabla_x^2\varphi$, $D_z\nabla_x\varphi$ and $\nabla_x D_z\varphi$.*

We are now in a position to give the definition of viscosity solution for the mixed-path-dependent PDE (9).

**Definition 5.2.** *An upper (resp., lower) semicontinuous function $u\colon\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ is called a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) to (9) if:*

(i) *For each $(t,z,\zeta_t,x)\in[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$ and any $\varphi\in\mathbb{C}^{1,2,2}(\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $(t,z,x)$ is a local maximum (resp., minimum) of $u(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)-\varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)$, with $(s,w,y)\in[t,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&D_t\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)+\mathcal{L}\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[D_{zz}\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)]+\mathrm{tr}[\nabla_x D_z\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)\sigma(\zeta^z_t,x)]+\\&+f(\zeta^z_t,x,u(\zeta^z_t,x),D_z\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)+\nabla_x\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)\sigma(\zeta^z_t,x))\geqslant 0,\ (\textit{resp.},\ \leqslant 0).\end{aligned}$$

(ii) *$u(\zeta_T,x)\leqslant g(\zeta_T,x)$ (resp., $u(\zeta_T,x)\geqslant g(\zeta_T,x)$) for every $(\zeta_T,x)\in\Lambda^d_T\times\mathbb{R}^n$.*

*A function $u\colon\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ is called a viscosity solution to (9) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution.*

The connection between the non-Markovian forward-backward system and the mixed-path-dependent PDE is shown in the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Under assumptions* $(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$, $(\mathbf{H}_f)$ *and* $(\mathbf{H}_g)$ *the function u defined in (5) is a viscosity solution to (9).*

*Proof.* We already know from Theorem 4.3 that the function $u$ is continuous. We only prove that $u$ is a viscosity subsolution, the other case being analogous. Take any $(t,z,\zeta_t,x)\in[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varphi\in\mathbb{C}^{1,2,2}(\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $(t,z,x)$ is a local maximum of $u(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)-\varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)$, with $(s,w,y)\in[t,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$. We assume, without loss of generality, that

$$u(\zeta^z_t,x)=\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x).$$

We suppose that

$$\begin{aligned}&D_t\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)+\mathcal{L}\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[D_{zz}\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)]+\mathrm{tr}[\nabla_x D_z\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)\sigma(\zeta^z_t,x)]+\\&\qquad+f(\zeta^z_t,x,u(\zeta^z_t,x),D_z\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)+\nabla_x\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)\sigma(\zeta^z_t,x))<0\end{aligned}$$

and we will find a contradiction. Let $\varepsilon\in(0,T-t)$ be such that for all $(s,w,y)\in[t,t+\varepsilon]\times\overline{B}_\varepsilon(z)\times\overline{B}_\varepsilon(x)$, we have:

$$u(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)\leqslant\varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}D_t\varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)+\mathcal{L}\varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[D_{zz}\varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)]+\mathrm{tr}[\nabla_x D_z\varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)\sigma(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)]+&\\ +f(\zeta^w_{t,s},y,u(\zeta^w_{t,s},y),D_z\varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)+\nabla_x\varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s},y)\sigma(\zeta^w_{t,s},y))<0.&\end{aligned}$$

Define the following stopping time

$$\tau=\inf\{s\geqslant t\colon |W(s)-W(t)|\geqslant\varepsilon\}\wedge\inf\{s\geqslant t\colon |X_{\zeta^z_t,x}(s)-x|\geqslant\varepsilon\}\wedge(t+\varepsilon).$$

Now we consider the following pair of processes

$$(\tilde{Y}(s),\tilde{Z}(s))_{s\in[t,t+\varepsilon]}=(Y_{\zeta^z_t,x}(s\wedge\tau),Z_{\zeta^z_t,x}(s)\mathbb{1}_{[0,\tau]}(s))_{s\in[t,t+\varepsilon]}.$$

$(\tilde{Y},\tilde{Z})$ solves the BSDE

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Y}(s)=u(W^{\zeta^z_t}_\tau,X_{\zeta^z_t,x}(\tau))-\int_s^{t+\varepsilon}\tilde{Z}(r)\mathrm{d}W(r)+&\\ +\int_s^{t+\varepsilon}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\tau]}(r)f(W^{\zeta^z_t}_r,X_{\zeta^z_t,x}(r),u(W^{\zeta^z_t}_r,X_{\zeta^z_t,x}(r)),\tilde{Z}(r))\mathrm{d}r,&\end{aligned}$$

for $s\in[t,t+\varepsilon]$. On the other hand, thanks to the functional Itô's formula (1) and Remark 2.5, we have that the following pair of processes

$$\begin{aligned}&(\hat{Y}(s),\hat{Z}(s))_{s\in[t,t+\varepsilon]}=\\ &\quad=(\varphi(W^{\zeta^z_t}_{s\wedge\tau},X_{\zeta^z_t,x}(s\wedge\tau)),(D_z\varphi+\nabla_x\varphi\sigma)(W^{\zeta^z_t}_s,X_{\zeta^z_t,x}(s))\mathbb{1}_{[0,\tau]}(s))_{s\in[t,t+\varepsilon]}\end{aligned}$$

solves the BSDE

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Y}(s)=\varphi(W^{\zeta^z_t}_\tau,X_{\zeta^z_t,x}(\tau))-\int_s^{t+\varepsilon}\hat{Z}(r)\mathrm{d}W(r)-\int_s^{t+\varepsilon}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\tau]}(r)\Big(D_t\varphi+\mathcal{L}\varphi+&\\ +\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[D_{zz}\varphi]+\mathrm{tr}[\nabla_x D_z\varphi\sigma]\Big)(W^{\zeta^z_t,x}_r,X_{\zeta^z_t,x}(r))\mathrm{d}r,&\end{aligned}$$

for $s\in[t,t+\varepsilon]$. Now, with the help of the comparison principle (Lemma 3.4), we deduce that $\tilde{Y}(t)<\hat{Y}(t)$, i.e., $u(\zeta^z_t,x)<\varphi(\zeta^z_t,x)$, which contradicts our assumptions. $\square$

Now we provide another definition of viscosity solution for the mixed-path-dependent PDE (9) by means of jets, needed later in the proof of the Comparison Theorem (Theorem 6.6). In the following definition we denote by $\mathbb{S}(m)$ the set of symmetric matrices of order $m$.

**Definition 5.4.** *Given an upper semicontinuous function* $u\colon\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ *we define the parabolic superjet of* $u$ *at* $(t,z,\zeta_t,x)\in[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$*, denoted by* $\mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\zeta^z_t,x)$*, as the set of triples* $(a,p,X)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{d+n}\times\mathbb{S}(d+n)$*, with*

$$p=\begin{pmatrix}p_z\\ p_x\end{pmatrix}\qquad\textit{and}\qquad X=\begin{pmatrix}X_{zz}&X_{zx}\\ X'_{zx}&X_{xx}\end{pmatrix},$$

*where* $p_z \in \mathbb{R}^d$*,* $p_x \in \mathbb{R}^n$*,* $X_{zz} \in \mathbb{S}(d)$*,* $X_{zx} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times n}$ *and* $X_{xx} \in \mathbb{S}(n)$*, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} u(\zeta^w_{t,s}, y) \leqslant u(\zeta^z_t, x) &+ a(s-t) + \langle p_z, w-z\rangle + \langle p_x, y-x\rangle + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\langle X_{zz}(w-z), w-z\rangle + \langle X_{zx}(y-x), w-z\rangle + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\langle X_{xx}(x-y), x-y\rangle + o(|s-t| + |w-z|^2 + |y-x|^2), \end{aligned}$$

*as* $s \to t^+$*,* $w \to z$ *and* $y \to x$*. We also introduce the parabolic limiting superjet:*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}u(\zeta^z_t, x) = \{&(a,p,X) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{d+n}\times\mathbb{S}(d+n) \colon \exists (t_n, z_n, \zeta^n_{t_n}, x_n, a_n, \\ &p_n, X_n) \text{ such that } (a_n, p_n, X_n) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\zeta^{n,z_n}_{t_n}, x_n) \text{ and} \\ &(z_n, \zeta^n_{t_n}, x_n, u(\zeta^{n,z_n}_{t_n}, x_n), a_n, p_n, X_n) \\ &\qquad\qquad\longrightarrow (z, \zeta_t, x, u(\zeta^z_t, x), a, p, X)\}. \end{aligned}$$

*When u is a lower semicontinuous function on* $\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$*, we define the parabolic subjet* $\mathcal{P}^{2,-}u(\zeta^z_t, x)$ *of u at* $(t, z, \zeta_t, x) \in [0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$ *by*

$$\mathcal{P}^{2,-}u(\zeta^z_t, x) = -\mathcal{P}^{2,+}(-u)(\zeta^z_t, x)$$

*and the parabolic limiting subjet* $\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}u(\zeta^z_t, x)$ *by*

$$\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}u(\zeta^z_t, x) = -\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}(-u)(\zeta^z_t, u).$$

In the following lemma we prove that the two definitions of viscosity solution for equation (9) given above are equivalent.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let* $u \colon \Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ *be an upper (resp., lower) semicontinuous function. Then u is a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) to (9) if and only if:*

(a) *For each* $(t, z, \zeta_t, x) \in [0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$ *and any* $(a,p,X) \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}u(\zeta^z_t, x)$ *(resp.,* $(a,p,X) \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}u(\zeta^z_t, x)$*) we have*

$$\begin{aligned} a + \langle p_x, b(\zeta^z_t, x)\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[\sigma\sigma'(\zeta^z_t, x)X_{xx}] + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[X_{zz}] + \mathrm{tr}[X_{zx}\sigma(\zeta^z_t, x)] + \\ + f(\zeta^z_t, x, u(\zeta^z_t, x), p_z + p_x\sigma(\zeta^z_t, x)) \geqslant 0, \qquad (\textit{resp.}, \ \leqslant 0). \end{aligned}$$

(b) $u(\zeta_T, x) \leqslant g(\zeta_T, x)$ *(resp.,* $u(\zeta_T, x) \geqslant g(\zeta_T, x)$*) for every* $(\zeta_T, x) \in \Lambda^d_T\times\mathbb{R}^n$*.*

*Proof.* Suppose that $u\colon \Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is an upper semicontinuous function and satisfies (a) of Lemma 5.5. Let $\varphi \in \mathbb{C}^{1,2,2}(\Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that $(t, z, x)$ is a local maximum of $u(\zeta^w_{t,s}, y) - \varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s}, y)$, with $(s, w, y) \in [t,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^n$. We assume, without loss of generality, that

$$u(\zeta^z_t, x) = \varphi(\zeta^z_t, x).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} u(\zeta^w_{t,s}, y) \leqslant \varphi(\zeta^w_{t,s}, y) &= u(\zeta^z_t, x) + D_t\varphi(\zeta^z_t, x)(s-t) + \langle D_z\varphi(\zeta^z_t, x), w-z\rangle + \\ &+ \langle \nabla_x\varphi(\zeta^z_t, x), y-x\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\langle D_{zz}\varphi(\zeta^z_t, x)(w-z), w-z\rangle + \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \tfrac{1}{2}\langle \nabla_x^2\varphi(\zeta_t^z, x)(y-x), y-x\rangle + \langle \nabla_x D_z\varphi(\zeta_t^z, x)(w-z), y-x\rangle + \\ + o(|s-t| + |w-z|^2 + |y-x|^2),$$

as $s \to t^+$, $w \to z$ and $y \to x$. Define $a := D_t\varphi(\zeta_t^z, x)$,

$$p := \begin{pmatrix} D_z\varphi(\zeta_t^z, x) \\ \nabla_x\varphi(\zeta_t^z, x) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad X := \begin{pmatrix} D_{zz}\varphi(\zeta_t^z, x) & D_z\nabla_x\varphi(\zeta_t^z, x) \\ \nabla_x D_z\varphi(\zeta_t^z, x) & \nabla_x^2\varphi(\zeta_t^z, x) \end{pmatrix},$$

then $(a, p, X) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\zeta_t^z, x)$, therefore (i) of Definition 5.2 holds true.

Now suppose that $u$ is a viscosity subsolution to (9). Let $(t, z, \zeta_t, x) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(a, p, X) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\zeta_t^z, x)$. Define $\psi_{\zeta_t^z, x} \colon \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\psi_{\zeta_t^z,x}(\overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}, y) := u(\zeta_t^z, x) + a(\bar{t} - t) + \langle p_z, w - z\rangle + \langle p_x, y - x\rangle + \\ + \frac{1}{2}\langle X_{zz}(w-z), w-z\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle X_{xx}(y-x), y-x\rangle + \\ + \langle X_{xz}(w-z), y-x\rangle,$$

for every $(\bar{t}, \overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}, y) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$, where

$$w := \overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}(\bar{t}) - \zeta_t(t \wedge \bar{t}).$$

Note that $\psi_{\zeta_t^z,x} \in \mathbb{C}^{1,2,2}(\Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Now consider

$$v_{\zeta_t^z,x}(\overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}, y) := u(\overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}, y) - \psi_{\zeta_t^z,x}(\overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}, y), \qquad \forall (\bar{t}, \overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}, y) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

then there exists a continuous function $h_{\zeta_t^z,x} \colon [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$v_{\zeta_t^z,x}(\zeta_{t,s}^w, y) \leqslant |t-s||w-z|^2|y-s|^2 h_{\zeta_t^z,x}(s, w, y),$$

when $(s, w, y)$ is in a neighborhood of $(t, z, x)$ and

$$h_{\zeta_t^z,x}(s, w, y) \to 0, \qquad \text{as} \quad (s, w, y) \to (t, z, x).$$

Let

$$k(\delta, \alpha, \beta) := \sup_{[(t-\delta)\vee 0,\, (t+\delta)\wedge T] \times B_\alpha(z) \times B_\beta(x)} |h_{\zeta_t^z,x}(s, w, y)|,$$

for all $\delta \in [0, T]$ and $\alpha, \beta \geqslant 0$. Then we define

$$\varphi_0(\overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}, y) := \int_{|\bar{t}-t|}^{(2|\bar{t}-t|)\wedge T} \mathrm{d}\delta \int_{|w-z|}^{2|w-z|} \mathrm{d}a \int_a^{2a} \mathrm{d}\alpha \int_{|y-x|}^{2|y-x|} \mathrm{d}b \int_b^{2b} k(\delta, \alpha, \beta)\mathrm{d}\beta.$$

for every $(\bar{t}, \overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}, y) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$, where

$$w := \overline{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}(\bar{t}) - \zeta_t(t \wedge \bar{t}).$$

As a consequence $\varphi_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{1,2,2}(\Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, moreover

$$\varphi_0(\zeta_t^z, x) = 0, \qquad D_t\varphi_0(\zeta_t^z, x) = 0, \qquad D_z\varphi_0(\zeta_t^z, x) = 0, \qquad \nabla_x\varphi_0(\zeta_t^z, x) = 0$$

and

$$D_{zz}\varphi_0(\zeta_t^z, x) = 0, \qquad \nabla_x D_z \varphi_0(\zeta_t^z, x) = 0, \qquad \nabla_x^2 \varphi_0(\zeta_t^z, x) = 0.$$

Furthermore, when $s$ is sufficiently close to $t$, namely $(2|s-t|) \wedge T = 2|s-t|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2|s-t||w-z|^2|y-x|^2 k(|s-t|, |w-z|, |y-x|) \leqslant \varphi_0(\zeta_{t,s}^w, y) \leqslant \\ \leqslant 3|s-t||w-z|^2|y-x|^2 k(2|s-t|, 4|w-z|, 4|y-x|). \end{aligned}$$

Now it is enough to consider $\varphi := \psi_{\zeta_t^z, x} + \varphi_0$ and to apply the definition of viscosity subsolution.

Finally, since $b$, $\sigma$ and $f$ are continuous functions on their domains of definition, the inequality in (a) holds true also for all $(a, p, X) \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}u(\zeta_t^z, x)$. □

## 6. Uniqueness

In [12] the author proves a comparison theorem for viscosity solutions of path-dependent PDEs. In the present section we show that our mixed-path-dependent PDE (9) is related to a path-dependent PDE, given by equation (10) below. In particular, we prove that a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) for the MPPDE corresponds to a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) for the PPDE, see Lemma 6.5. In this way we can exploit the result presented in [12] to prove a comparison theorem for the MPPDE (9).

Consider the following path-dependent PDE:

$$\begin{cases} D_t\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t) + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t) + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[D_{zz}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t)] + \mathrm{tr}[D_{zx}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t)\tilde{\sigma}(\zeta_t, \eta_t)] \\ \qquad + \tilde{f}(\zeta_t, \eta_t, \tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t), D_z\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t) + D_x\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t)\tilde{\sigma}(\zeta_t, \eta_t)) = 0, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{on } [0, T) \times \Lambda^{d+n}, \\ \tilde{u}(\zeta_T, \eta_T) = \tilde{g}(\zeta_T, \eta_T), \qquad\qquad \text{on } \Lambda_T^{d+n}, \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

where the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t) = \langle D_x\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t), \tilde{b}(\zeta_t, \eta_t)\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[\tilde{\sigma}(\zeta_t, \eta_t)\tilde{\sigma}'(\zeta_t, \eta_t)D_{xx}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t)],$$

with

$$\tilde{b}(\zeta_t, \eta_t) := b(\zeta_t, \eta_t(t)), \qquad \tilde{\sigma}(\zeta_t, \eta_t) := \sigma(\zeta_t, \eta_t(t))$$

and

$$\tilde{f}(\zeta_t, \eta_t, y, z) := f(\zeta_t, \eta_t(t), y, z), \qquad \tilde{g}(\zeta_T, \eta_T) := g(\zeta_T, \eta_T(T)),$$

for every $(t, \zeta_t, \eta_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^{d+n}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $(\zeta_T, \eta_T) \in \Lambda_T^{d+n}$.

We give the definition of viscosity solution for the path-dependent PDE (10) by means of jets, following [12].

**Definition 6.1.** *Given an upper semicontinuous functional $\tilde{u} \colon \Lambda^{d+n} \to \mathbb{R}$ we define the parabolic superjet of $\tilde{u}$ at $(t, z, x, \zeta_t, \eta_t) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^{d+n} \times \Lambda^{d+n}$, denoted by $\mathcal{P}^{2,+}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)$, as the set of triples $(a, p, X) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+n} \times \mathbb{S}(d+n)$, with*

$$p = \begin{pmatrix} p_z \\ p_x \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad X = \begin{pmatrix} X_{zz} & X_{zx} \\ X'_{zx} & X_{xx} \end{pmatrix},$$

*where $p_z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $p_x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $X_{zz} \in \mathbb{S}(d)$, $X_{zx} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times n}$ and $X_{xx} \in \mathbb{S}(n)$, such that*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{u}(\zeta_{t,s}^{w}, \eta_{t,s}^{y}) \leqslant \tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x) + a(s-t) + \langle p_z, w-z\rangle + \langle p_x, y-x\rangle + \\
+ \frac{1}{2}\langle X_{zz}(w-z), w-z\rangle + \langle X_{zx}(y-x), w-z\rangle + \\
+ \frac{1}{2}\langle X_{xx}(x-y), x-y\rangle + o(|s-t| + |w-z|^2 + |y-x|^2),
\end{aligned}
$$

*as $s \to t^+$, $w \to z$ and $y \to x$. We also introduce the parabolic limiting superjet:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x) = \{(a,p,X) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{d+n}\times\mathbb{S}(d+n)\colon \exists(t_n, z_n, x_n, \zeta_{t_n}^n, \eta_{t_n}^n, a_n, \\
p_n, X_n) \text{ such that } (a_n, p_n, X_n) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,+}\tilde{u}(\zeta_{t_n}^{n,z_n}, \eta_{t_n}^{n,x_n}) \text{ and} \\
(z_n, x_n, \zeta_{t_n}^n, \eta_{t_n}^n, \tilde{u}(\zeta_{t_n}^{n,z_n}, \eta_{t_n}^{n,x_n}), a_n, p_n, X_n) \\
\longrightarrow (z, x, \zeta_t, \eta_t, \tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x), a, p, X)\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

*When $\tilde{u}$ is a lower semicontinuous functional on $\Lambda^{d+n}$, we define the parabolic subjet $\mathcal{P}^{2,-}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)$ of $\tilde{u}$ at $(t, z, x, \zeta_t, \eta_t) \in [0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{d+n}\times\Lambda^{d+n}$ by*

$$
\mathcal{P}^{2,-}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x) = -\mathcal{P}^{2,+}(-\tilde{u})(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)
$$

*and the parabolic limiting subjet $\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)$ by*

$$
\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x) = -\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}(-\tilde{u})(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x).
$$

**Definition 6.2.** *An upper (resp., lower) semicontinuous functional $\tilde{u}\colon \Lambda^{d+n} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) to (10) if:*

(i) *For each $(t, z, x, \zeta_t, \eta_t) \in [0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{d+n}\times\Lambda^{d+n}$ and any $(a,p,X) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,+}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)$ (resp., $(a,p,X) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,-}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)$) we have*

$$
\begin{aligned}
a + \langle p_x, \tilde{b}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\sigma}'(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)X_{xx}] + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[X_{zz}] + \mathrm{tr}[X_{zx}\tilde{\sigma}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)] + \\
+ \tilde{f}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x, \tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x), p_z + p_x\tilde{\sigma}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)) \geqslant 0, \qquad (\textit{resp., } \leqslant 0).
\end{aligned}
$$

(ii) *$\tilde{u}(\zeta_T, \eta_T) \leqslant \tilde{g}(\zeta_T, \eta_T)$ (resp., $\tilde{u}(\zeta_T, \eta_T) \geqslant \tilde{g}(\zeta_T, \eta_T)$) for every $(\zeta_T, \eta_T) \in \Lambda_T^{d+n}$.*

*A functional $\tilde{u}\colon \Lambda^{d+n} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a viscosity solution to (10) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution.*

**Remark 6.3.** *Since $\tilde{b}$, $\tilde{\sigma}$ and $\tilde{f}$ are continuous functions on their domains of definition, in Definition 6.2 the inequality in (i) holds true also for all $(a,p,X) \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)$ (resp., $(a,p,X) \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}\tilde{u}(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x)$).*

As mentioned at the beginning of the section, the path-dependent PDE (10) is relevant since it is related to the MPPDE (9). This point is clarified in the next remark and in the lemma below.

**Remark 6.4.** *Let $u\colon \Lambda^d\times\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be an upper semicontinuous function and consider $\tilde{u}\colon \Lambda^{d+n} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by*

$$
\tilde{u}(\zeta_t, \eta_t) := u(\zeta_t, \eta_t(t)), \qquad \forall (t, \zeta_t, \eta_t) \in [0,T]\times\Lambda^{d+n}. \tag{11}
$$

*Then $\tilde u$ is an upper semicontinuous functional on $\Lambda^{d+n}$, moreover*

$$\mathcal{P}^{2,+}\tilde u(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t^x) = \mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\zeta_t^z, \eta_t(t) + x),$$

*for every $t \in [0,T]$, $(\zeta_t, \eta_t) \in \Lambda^{d+n}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The same equality holds true for the parabolic limiting superjet.*

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let $u\colon \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be an upper (resp., lower) semicontinuous function. Then $u$ is a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) to (9) if and only if $\tilde u$, defined in (11), is a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) to (10).*

*Proof.* The thesis follows from Lemma 5.5 and Remark 6.4. ☐

We are now in the position to prove the Comparison Theorem, adapting the results presented in [12] to our context.

**Theorem 6.6** (Comparison Theorem)**.** *Let $u, v\colon \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution to (9), respectively. Suppose that $u$ and $v$ satisfy the following polynomial growth condition: There exists an integer $m > 0$ such that for every $(\bar t, \bar\zeta_T) \in [0,T] \times \Lambda_T^d$ we have*

$$\frac{|u(\zeta_t^z, x)| + |v(\zeta_t^z, x)|}{1 + |(z,x)|^m} \to 0, \qquad as \quad |(z,x)| \to \infty,$$

*uniformly in $t \in [0,T]$ and $\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d_{\bar\zeta_{\bar t}}$, where*

$$\Lambda^d_{\bar\zeta_{\bar t}} := \bigcup_{r \in [0,\bar t]} \Big\{\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d \colon \zeta_t(s) = \bar\zeta_T(s \wedge r),\ s \in [0,t]\Big\}.$$

*Then $u \leqslant v$ on $\Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$.*

*Proof.* From Lemma 6.5 we know that $u$ is a viscosity subsolution to (9) if and only if $\tilde u\colon \Lambda^{d+n} \to \mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$\tilde u(\zeta_t, \eta_t) := u(\zeta_t, \eta_t(t)), \qquad \forall (t, \zeta_t, \eta_t) \in [0,T] \times \Lambda^{d+n},$$

is a viscosity subsolution to (10). Analogously, $v$ is a viscosity supersolution to (9) if and only if $\tilde v\colon \Lambda^{d+n} \to \mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$\tilde v(\zeta_t, \eta_t) := v(\zeta_t, \eta_t(t)), \qquad \forall (t, \zeta_t, \eta_t) \in [0,T] \times \Lambda^{d+n},$$

is a viscosity supersolution to (10). Furthermore, since we assumed in hypothesis $(\mathbf{H}_f)$ (see also Remark 3.1), that the function $f$ is nonincreasing with respect to $y$, the following condition holds true: For every $(\zeta_t, x) \in \Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^{d+n}$ and $X \in \mathbb{S}(d+n)$ we have ($\mathbb{I}_d$ is the identity matrix of dimension $d$):

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\Big[(\mathbb{I}_d, \sigma(\zeta_t, x)')X\begin{pmatrix}\mathbb{I}_d \\ \sigma(\zeta_t, x)\end{pmatrix}\Big] &+ f(\zeta_t, x, \alpha, p_z + p_x\sigma(\zeta_t, x)) \\ &- f(\zeta_t, x, \beta, p_z + p_x\sigma(\zeta_t, x)) \leqslant 0,\end{aligned}$$

when $\alpha \geqslant \beta$ and $X \leqslant 0$. Therefore the thesis follows from the Comparison Theorem (Theorem 16) proved in [12]. ☐

**Corollary 6.7.** *Under assumptions* $(\mathbf{H}_{b,\sigma})$, $(\mathbf{H}_f)$ *and* $(\mathbf{H}_g)$, *the function* $u$ *defined in (5) is the unique viscosity solution to the mixed-path-dependent PDE (9), continuous on* $\Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$ *and satisfying the following polynomial growth condition: There exists an integer* $m > 0$ *such that for every* $(\bar{t}, \bar{\zeta}_T) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda^d_T$ *we have*

$$\frac{|u(\zeta_t^z, x)|}{1 + |(z, x)|^m} \to 0, \qquad \textit{as} \quad |(z, x)| \to \infty, \tag{12}$$

*uniformly in* $t \in [0, T]$ *and* $\zeta_t \in \Lambda^d_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}}$, *where*

$$\Lambda^d_{\bar{\zeta}_{\bar{t}}} := \bigcup_{r \in [0, \bar{t}]} \Big\{ \zeta_t \in \Lambda^d : \zeta_t(s) = \bar{\zeta}_T(s \wedge r),\ s \in [0, t] \Big\}.$$

*Proof.* We know from Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 5.3 that the function $u$ introduced in (5) is a viscosity solution to (9), continuous on $\Lambda^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Finally, the polynomial growth condition (12) was proved in Proposition 4.4, so that the uniqueness follows from the Comparison Theorem, Theorem 6.6. ☐

## References

[1] R. Buckdahn, J. Ma, Stochastic viscosity solutions for nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations I, Stochastic Process. Appl. 93 (2001), no. 2, 181-204.

[2] R. Buckdahn, J. Ma, Stochastic viscosity solutions for nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations II, Stochastic Process. Appl. 93 (2001), no. 2, 205-228.

[3] R. Cont, D.-A. Fournié, Functional Itô calculus and stochastic integral representation of martingales, arXiv:1002.2446, 2010.

[4] R. Cont, D.-A. Fournié, A functional extension of the Ito formula, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 348 (2010), no. 1-2, 57-61.

[5] R. Cont, D.-A. Fournié, Change of variable formulas for non-anticipative functionals on path space, J. Funct. Anal. 259 (2010), no. 4, 1043-1072.

[6] B. Dupire, Functional Itô calculus, Portfolio Research Paper 2009-04, Bloomberg, 2009.

[7] I. Ekren, C. Keller, N. Touzi, J. Zhang, On Viscosity Solutions of Path Dependent PDEs, arXiv:1109.5971, 2011.

[8] P.-L. Lions, P. Souganidis, Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 326 (1998), no. 9, 1085-1092.

[9] P.-L. Lions, P. Souganidis, Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations: non-smooth equations and applications, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 327 (1998), no. 8, 735-741.

[10] E. Pardoux, S. Peng, Backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations, Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci., 176, Springer, Berlin, 1992.

[11] S. Peng, Probabilistic interpretation for systems of quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations, Stochastics Stochastics Rep. 37 (1991), no. 1-2, 61-74.

[12] S. Peng, Note on Viscosity Solution of Path-Dependent PDE and G-Martingales, arXiv:1106.1144, 2011.

[13] S. Peng, F. Wang, BSDE, Path-dependent PDE and Nonlinear Feynman-Kac Formula, arXiv:1108.4317, 2011.

[14] S. Tang, Semi-linear systems of backward stochastic partial differential equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B 26 (2005), no. 3, 437-456.